



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Mamluk style; the first being of early origin, though, in his opinion, there are no works in museums that antedate the thirteenth century, while the Mamluk style flourished mainly in the fourteenth, and was derived directly from Fatimy and early-Syrian schools. Of *Glass-work* the most remarkable examples are the famous mosque-lamps of enamelled glass, whose material is almost entirely concealed by the gilding and the enamels of different colors. In the chapter on *Textile fabrics*, we see that less originality is shown in this than in other branches, and their dependence on Byzantine models, on the one hand, and on Persian textiles, on the other, is evident. If Mr. Poole had written his book a couple of years later, he would have been able to point out interesting analogies with the wonderful textiles lately found in Egyptian tombs, which are already making their way to European museums, some of which, from Koptic tombs dating between the fourth and ninth centuries, are important for the derivation of Saracenic work. The illustrations, though merely woodcuts, are satisfactory and sufficiently numerous to convey an adequate impression of each branch of art.

A. L. FROTHINGHAM, JR.

GOSHEN AND THE SHRINE OF SAFT EL HENNEH (1885) [Fourth Memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund] by EDOUARD NAVILLE. 4to, pp. 26; with eleven plates, including maps and plans. London, 1887: Trübner & Co.

The present memoir gives an account of the results of the campaign of the Egypt Exploration Fund during 1885, under the charge of M. Naville. They are by no means so important as the greater part of the investigations of the Fund—in fact, may be considered as the least important. The memoir deals not so much with any important monuments as with the identification of certain sites, the central point of interest being the localization and delimitation of the Land of Goshen.

The first site attacked in 1885 was that of the large village called Saft el Henneh, between Zagazig and Tel el Kebir, which is on the site of an ancient city: "the whole village is constructed on the ruins of old houses." The ground had been already thoroughly ransacked, though the area of a temple was found and cleared. The most important result was the recovery of about one-half of the famous shrine of Saft of the time of Nectanebo II.¹ In connection with this admirable work, M. Naville remarks: "Look-

¹ The following is the table of contents of the volume: *Saft el Henneh*, p. 1. *The Thirtieth Dynasty*, p. 3. *The Monuments discovered*, p. 5. *Phacusa, Goshen, Ramses*, p. 14. *Khataana, Kantir*, p. 21. *Tell Rotab*, p. 24. *Appendix*, p. 26.

ing at the monuments of the two Nectanebos, it is impossible not to be struck by the beauty of the workmanship, as well as by the richness of the material employed. Egyptian art undergoes a new resurrection more complete than under the twenty-sixth dynasty. There is more vigour in the style than at the time of the Psammetichi; perhaps less delicacy than in the works of the Saïte Kings, but a decided tendency to revert to the stern beauty of the works of the great Pharoahs . . . The Nectanebos did not cut up the colossi of former Kings, or engrave their names on monuments which they had not erected . . . for their models, they seem to have chosen the Kings of the twelfth dynasty." M. Naville instances a number of works belonging to this thirtieth dynasty: he explains the number of monuments erected by the Nectanebos in the eastern part of the Delta, by suggesting the use of the temples as fortresses: "The Nectanebos were constantly exposed to invasions from the east. They had again and again to fight the armies of the Persians; therefore they built these temples which were primarily religious buildings, but which could also be converted into military forts, and thus help in the defence of the country." The monuments discovered at Saft are (1) part of a colossal black-granite statue of Rameses II, indicating the erection here of a temple by this monarch; (2) part of a stele of Nekht-horheb, first ruler of the thirtieth dynasty; (3) monuments of Nectanebo II, including (*a*) remains of a standing statue of the god Sopt, (*b*) parts of the great shrine; (4) stele of Ptolemy Philadelphos. The shrine is one of the largest and most beautiful of its kind, being nearly seven feet thick, six feet wide, and over seven feet high, covered with hieroglyphs on all sides: it is dedicated to *Sopt, the lord of the East; the spirit of the East and the Horus of the East*. Sopt is evidently a warlike god, the defender of the eastern frontier of Egypt. The author studies this monument very carefully, giving a translation and commentary of the long inscriptions, which are interesting for the study of mythology.

In the chapter *Phacusa, Goshen, Ramses*, M. Naville studies the extent and position of the nome of Arabia, and its relation to the Land of Goshen. He thinks that the nome of Sopt or Soptakhem = the nome of Arabia: its capital was *Pa Sopt = Saft el Henneh*. Ptolemy says that *Phacusa* was the capital of the nome of Arabia. This *Phacusa* is not the modern Fakoos, for Strabo describes the canal from the Nile to the Red Sea as branching off at *Phacusa*, and this position is exactly that of *Saft el Henneh*: this identity is confirmed by the name on the shrine, *Pa Kes*. Furthermore, "when Van der Hardt interpreted the word *Phacusa*, it was not only the Egyptian form of the name (*Pa Kes*) which he discovered, but also the origin of the famous name of *Goshen*," which is read by the Greeks Γεσέμ, Γεσέν, Καισράν, Κεσράν. "In fact, it was near *Phacusa* that the land of Goshen was to be looked for. The Septuagint calls it Γεσέμ Ἀραβίας, *Gesem*

of *Arabia, etc.*" This appellation of the Septuagint M. Naville considers to have "a definite meaning: *Gesem which is in the nome of Arabia.*" He speaks of a number of instances in which this district is named *Kesem*, in Egyptian documents. I can only refer to the book itself for further details regarding this theory: it is but necessary to add that M. Naville agrees to the equivalence of the name of Goshen and Ramses, though he considers the latter to cover a larger area than the former. The term "land of Ramses" was evidently a vague name—not belonging to administrative nomenclature.

A. L. F., JR.

DENKMÄLER GRIECHISCHER UND RÖMISCHER SCULPTUR in historischer Anordnung unter Leitung von HEINRICH BRUNN herausgegeben von FRIEDRICH BRUCKMANN.

MONUMENTS OF GREEK AND ROMAN SCULPTURE historically arranged under the direction of HEINRICH BRUNN, edited by FRIEDRICH BRUCKMANN. Large folio. Munich-London, 1888: Asher & Co.

This colossal work is to consist of about 80 parts at the price of £1 each, and to contain, when completed, about 400 large-folio plates measuring 18 by 25 inches. Professor Brunn's object is to facilitate the comparative study of the works of classic sculpture by collecting into one *corpus* all its principal monuments, reproduced by the very best process—that of permanent phototype. But, as Professor Brunn remarks in his prospectus, "in carrying out this object a careful selection necessarily had to be made. Not only were inferior or average specimens excluded, but even many of better quality which cannot yet be grouped in logical historic sequence, and which, consequently, instead of throwing light on the development of Art, themselves need the light of further scientific research. . . The first consideration was naturally claimed by all such monuments as may safely be regarded as original in conception or execution. Failing these, antique copies could not of course be dispensed with. . . This collection is not intended so much to illustrate the text of a systematic history of Art, as itself to exhibit the very embodiment of such a history. . . Although the arrangement must always be fundamentally historical, it is at the same time obvious that, if followed too closely, this principle itself would be far from achieving the desired object. It must consequently be supplemented not only by a consideration of local schools, but also by adopting such an arrangement of the objects themselves as will best enable them to mutually illustrate and explain each other. The accompanying short text is